DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 958 EA 022 619

AUTHOR	Reed, Patricia; Cejda, Brent
TITLE	Collaboration between and among Schools, Institutions of Higher Education, and State Education Agencies: An Annotated Bibliography. Instructional Leadership and School Improvement Report Series.
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Elmhurst, IL.
PUB DATE	87
NOTE	24p.; For a related document, see EA 022 618.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 295 Emroy Avenue, Elmhurst, IL 60126 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Annotated Bibliographies; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Leadership; *Organizational Communication; Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

The 45 items included in this annotated bibliography address issues related to both the general attributes of successful interorganizational collaboration and the organizational preconditions that may foster effective collaboration between schools, institutions of higher education, and state education agencies as they interact in the professional development of educational personnel. Published between 1970 and 1986, the documents annotated examine such areas as the functional relationship between universities and public schools, school-university collaboration related to the development of teacher education programs and inservice education programs, the political realities of staff development, and the role of interorganizational collaboration in school improvement. Other documents identify problems that hinder the development of collaborative efforts between schools, institutes of higher education, and state education agencies and the origins of those problems. The annotations stress the numerous principles present in the literature that are perceived as crucial to successful interorganizational collaboration and the attributes and preconditions described that set the stage for successful collaborative efforts. (CLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327958

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA HE

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Krueger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

EA 022 619

COLLABORATION BETWEEN AND AMONG SCHOOLS, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

An Annotated Bibliography

2

COLLABORATION BETWEEN AND AMONG SCHOOLS, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

An Annotated Bibliography

Prepared for

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

By

Patricia Reed and Brent Cejda

Bowling Green State University

One in a Series of Reports on
Instructional Leadership and School Improvement

1987

Copyright c 1987
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
295 Emroy Avenue
Elmhurst, Illinois 60126

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without permission in writing from the publisher.

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory is a nonprofit organization supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Laboratory or the funding agency, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

NCREL Order Number: ILS-712
Price: $6.00

Preface to Series

Instructional Leadership. School Improvement. These two phrases are now common in the lexicon of education. In a large and ever-growing body of research, the concepts of instructional leadership and school improvement have been hypothesized, operationalized, measured, correlated, and analyzed. And in the actions of educators and educational policy makers, the concepts have served as goals, means to ends, explanations, and evaluation standards. Uttered by presenters and participants in countless conferences and workshops and printed in just as countless articles and book chapters, instructional leadership and school improvement have become quite prominent in the jargon of the educational reform movement of the 1980s.

But commonness and prominence are no guarantees of consensus. As concepts, instructional leadership and school improvement are elusive and multifaceted. Both phrases acquire new meanings each time they are spoken, heard, or read. Definitions have emerged, have been challenged and refined, and seem to multiply like rabbits.

Important work to codify and translate the knowledge base on instructional leadership and school improvement has been accomplished. In Leadership: Examining the Elusive, the 1987 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and in Rethinking School Improvement: Research, Craft, and Concept, edited by Ann Lieberman and published by Teachers College Press in 1986, significant strides were taken to dissect and synthesize information pertinent to both themes.

Though some might say the work of producing information resources on instructional leadership is done, the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory thinks otherwise; "examining" and "rethinking" are, in fact, open-ended actions. Furthermore, interest in building instructional leadership and school improvement remains high among significant and large audiences: teachers, principals, district administrators, state education agency personnel, and staff in institutions of higher education.

In response to considerable interest in instructional leadership and school improvement among constituents in the seven state region, in 1986 the Laboratory initiated activities to develop information resources. A relationship was established with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management to prepare annotated bibliographies of pertinent resources and syntheses of literature on several specific topics. The products of this relationship with ERIC/CEM launched this series of publications.

Special credit for orchestrating the development of the series is due to Stuart Smith, Associate Director and Editor of ERIC/CEM and to Dr. Lawrence Friedman, Program Associate at NCREL. To them and to the authors and reviewers of products in this series, the Laboratory extends congratulations for work well done.

Jane H. Arends, Ph.D.
Executive Director

Harriet Doss Willis
Deputy Executive Director and
Director, Regional Programs

Judson Hixson
Director, R&D Resource Development

Introduction

Central to efforts to assure both quality and equality of education for all students in our nation's schools is the need for competent personnel. Thus, the professional development of teachers and other educational personnel has become a major focus of the current educational reform movement, and various proposals for improving upon present policies and practices have been formulated.

Local and state education agencies, as well as colleges and universities, are all important stakeholders in the professional development arena. Yet none of these stakeholders has the authority or the resources to undertake this task independently. It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the reform proposals emphasize the need for these stakeholders to collaborate. However, the generally accepted need for increased collaboration, has not been easily translated into practice. Instead, relationships between these three constituencies often continue to be more adversarial than complementary.

That collaboration remains the exception rather than the rule is attributable to many factors. Cultural, economic, and political barriers, as well as structural and technical problems, often provide greater impetus for unilateral rather than joint endeavors. Yet collaboration between schools, institutions of higher education, and state education agencies can and does occur. Furthermore, there is now a growing body of literature which can provide educators greater insight into the nature of collaborative relationships.

This bibliography includes annotations of a variety of references and resources that address issues related to both the general attributes of successful collaboration, and the organizational preconditions that appear to foster effective collaboration between schools, institutions of higher education, and state education agencies.

Beder, H. (1984). "Principles for successful collaboration." In Hal Beder (Ed.) Realizing the Potential of Interorganizational Cooperation. New Directions for Continuing Education, No. 23. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 85-90.

Identifies four dominant characteristics that explain successful and productive relationships between continuing education agencies and other organizations: reciprocity, system openness, an atmosphere of trust and commitment, and compatible organizational structure. Notes that for collaboration to flourish, the parties to it must tangibly benefit, and the key to benefit lies in a reciprocal relationship where both partners exchange resources valued less for resources valued more. Emphasizes the importance of relaxing organizational boundaries to permit greater input. Indicates that trust and commitment derive from at least two factors: the style and personality of key actors in the collaboration and differences in organizational culture. Points out that organizations that collaborate effectively generally adopt fluid and flexible structures that can adopt well to those of their partners. Concludes that continuing education agencies that do not possess these four characteristics will find it difficult to collaborate and the few collaborative relationships they do establish will tend to be unsuccessful and even dysfunctional for one or both partners.

Binker, J. B. and Neuberg, G. A. (1984). "An inservice education model: Teachers and professors as coequals." Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 15-17.

Describes the National Writing Project, a collaborative venture between teachers and professors which now numbers 122 national and international sites. The operating hypothesis of the NWP is that inservice education, which involves successful classroom teachers as equal partners in the training of other teachers, is a more effective approach than the traditional model, with its hierarchial relationships between university professors and K-12 classroom teachers. Conclusion is that NWP demonstrates effective use of collaboration in that (1) school system personnel and university faculty share responsibility for financing, scheduling, and implementing the activities of the site, (2) classroom teachers and university faculty associate equally in the summer institute as teachers and learners, and (3) classroom teachers and university faculty jointly plan inservice courses that focus on exemplary presentations made by successful classroom teachers trained in the summer institute.

Boyer, E. L. (1981). "High school/college partnerships that work." High School/College Partnerships. 1981 Current Issues in Higher Education No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1-4.

Discusses five basic principles which the author believes to be crucial to collaboration. One, to achieve school/college cooperation educators at both levels must agree that they do indeed have common problems. Two, in order to achieve greater collaboration, the traditional academic "pecking order" must be overcome. Three, if school/college collaboration is to succeed the project must be sharply focused. Four, if school/college cooperation is to succeed, those who participate must get recognition and rewards. Five, for school/college cooperation to succeed it must focus on action not machinery.

Carpenter, R. L. and Mahlios, M. C. (1982). "Functional relationships between universities and public schools." Education, 102(4), 339-342.

Presents a model for university-public school cooperation based on the authors' experiences in establishing an Educational Research and Services Council. Activities undertaken through this collaborative effort were of three types: curriculum development, organizational and staff

development, and research. Identifies five important attributes of a cooperative model: volunteerism, responsiveness, bilateral decision-making, a nucleus of commitment, and a sense of organizational evolution.

Collins, R. L. (1983). "Linking higher education and the public schools." Educational Forum, 48(1), 27-33.

Analyzes the Boston school/university partnerships resulting from the 1975 court order to desegregate Boston Public Schools. Considers collaboration from three perspectives: technical, political and cultural. States hypothesis regarding each of these facets of collaboration and concludes that political and organizational realities within each prospective school/ university partnership play a critical role in the development of such a partnership.

DeBevoise, W. (1986). "Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework." Educational Leadership, 43(5), 9-12.

Distills principles of successful collaborative relationships from experiences of those involved in the long-term cooperation between the University of Louisville and its School of Education and the Jefferson County (Kentucky) Public Schools. Notes that additional impetus to this cooperation was given with the arrival of three new top-level administrators (the University President, the Superintendent of Schools, and the Dean of the School of Education) at a time when both institutions needed to change. Openness to risk the innovation in both institutions is making experimentation possible. This includes the School of Education and the public schools planning an academy that will be jointly administered and staffed and will permit university personnel to work in and for the public schools and simultaneously allow school district personnel to work in and for the university in teacher education and administrative leadership. Notes that this collaborative effort will probably require a contractual agreement and a new governance structure but that collaborative activities can embrace diverse connections between institutions from formal agreement as in the case of the academy. The nature of a collaborative arrangement depends on what the cooperating parties hope to achieve. However, the goal of improving the way children learn in school, which should be at the heart of any school-university collaboration, necessarily involves the entire continuum of connecting relationships. Collaboration rests upon trust between the cooperating parties thus enabling them to share authority. By giving up a portion of their sovereignty, participants can accomplish goals that will bring greater strength and recognition to their individual institutions. However, the necessary trust and willingness to give up authority takes years of shared experience, patience, and nurturing and the importance of individual commitment and personalities cannot be overemphasized. Furthermore, ultimately the collaborators need to recognize not only their own interests but the needs and perspectives of all represented in the collaborative venture. Concludes by presenting six principles of collaboration derived from interviews of experienced collaborators in this university/school collaboration: (1) Collaboration starts with administrative support; (2) Not everyone is born to collaborate but collaboration depends upon a "community of believers" who form the core of a collaborative effort; (3) Collaborators need to have realistic expectations; thus while enthusiasm is important, it should not obscure the need for a hard-nosed assessment of resources and time; (4) Collaborators should work toward consumer satisfaction with schools and universities each considering the other institution as a consumer of their services; (5) Collaborators should avoid becoming involved in the internal politics of the other institution; and (6) Collaboration relies on effective delivery and reception systems and it helps to have personnel from both institutions assigned the task of matching needs and services.

Dillon, E. A. (1974). "Staff development: Whose job is it?" Educational Leadership. 32(2), 137-140.

Proposes that school districts, institutions of higher education, and teacher organizations each identify a particular area of responsibility for which they are best qualified to render a service related to staff development. Presents a design for a cooperative staff development program based on this rationale. Notes, however, that while such efforts have great potential, successful collaboration in staff development will require a kind of parity which does not now exist. Successful collaboration will also require members of the three organizations to operate in an atmosphere of greater openness and trust.

Durden, W. G. (1985). "Early instruction by the college: Johns Hopkins's center for talented youth." In Daly, W. T. (Ed.), College-School Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 37-46.

One major conclusion emerged from experiences at Johns Hopkins University in developing a collaborative program for providing early college instruction for academically talented youth. If partnership is to be more than another method of preserving the educational status quo, then school-college partnership must confront directly the shadow politic of education. Suspicions, prejudices, and assumptions developed over centuries which separate the various levels of educational institutions must be confronted and addressed.

Fox, G. T., Anglin, L., Fromberg, D., and Grady, M. (1986). Collaborating: lessons learned from experience. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

The authors analyze their experiences in the Teacher Corp program and conclude there are five essential lessons they learned. First, for collaboration to be effective in staff development, the collaboration must be among people and among institutions. Second, a new role--that of the venture educator must be developed to help mediate responses to local educational problems. Third, institutional barriers to collaborative action between colleges of education and schools must be reduced. Fourth, missions and responsibilities of colleges of education and schools must be redistributed if professional development opportunities for all educators are to improve. Fifth, the preceding four lessons must be applied simultaneously in local strategies to improve staff development for teachers through collaboration. Included are examples of specific concerns relating to each of these lessons and identification of the types of barriers and restrictions to collaboration which typically characterize schools and colleges of education.

Gabrys, R. (1981). "Professional development perspective of classroom management and school effectiveness." In C. Prentis (Ed.) Improving School Practice: Summary and Proceedings of the 1981 AFL Regional Forum. Charleston, West Virginia: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 996).

Identifies four necessary components of collaboration for professional development. Collaborative decision making in planning and carrying out learning activities is identified as being a key to facilitating teacher input and involvement. Incentives for participation and explicit support by the school district and building administrators shows support, places importance, and increases the chance of successful professional development programs. Facilitators must be competent and agreed upon by both the school district and university to ensure that the professional development program encompasses the area of classroom management and works towards improving school effectiveness.

Gallegos, A. M. (1980). "Political realities of staff development." Journal of Teacher Education. 31(1), 21-24.

Indicates that while there is little to criticize about the concept of collaboration among various professional groups in staff development, different incentives have emerged in some areas of the country that distort the intent of collaboration and prevent the full realization of the benefits anticipated. The movement toward equalization of funding to school districts and adoption of a common statewide salary schedule, the growing tendency of schools of education faced with continual enrollment declines to view staff development as a vital area for professional involvement, and the need of school districts to recapture the responsibility and authority for screening learning experiences are creating differing agendas under which true collaboration is difficult to attain.

Hawley, S. & Branch, J. (1978). Analysis of core questions in the theory-practice gap. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (58th). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 159 160).

Issues surrounding the mandate from the state of Ohio that teacher education programs be developed cooperatively by schools and colleges/universities are examined. The authors perceived the intent of the mandate as a means to get preservice teachers into the field earlier and to involve the "real" world of teaching in their preparation, thus reducing the theory-practice gap. The issues are divided into two groups: the school district perspective and the college or university perspective. Issues directly related to establishing collaboration in teacher education programs are: 1) the methods that will be established to insure ongoing communication between college and fieldbased staff; 2) how school personnel will be involved in planning, implementation, and evaluation of teacher preparation programs; 3) the cooperative development of criteria to assess each field-based experience; 4) the kinds and amount of experiences that will be made available to prepare field-based personnel and/or college faculty; and 5) if public agreement to the school's participation in teacher preparation should be considered. The authors conclude that collaboration in teacher education programs allows the best of both institutions (school and college or university) to complement each other but that the degree of success in these efforts will be directly proportional to the resolution of the issues contained within this paper.

Hohman, L. (1985). "Interorganizational collaboration in continuing professional education." In R. M. Cervero and L. Scanlon (Eds.), Problems and Prospects in Continuing Professional Education. New Directions for Continuing Education No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 75-85.

Draws attention to fact that collaboration is a quintessential political process. Reiterates findings of an earlier study that the central problem area in collaboration is not any specific educational issue (curriculum, faculty, evaluation) but the issue of defining turf. Identifies four trends and their implications for collaboration in continuing professional education. These are: the changing perception of competence; the growing recognition of interdependence among the professions; the changing perception of professional maturity; and the demise of "private practice" as an increasing number of professionals practice in organizations and on teams. Five key issues of collaboration are identified. These include: form of interaction (cooperation, coordination, or collaboration); climate and preconditions (environmental factors); determinants (factors making specific organizations form specific commitments); agreements (formal commitments specifying amount/type of resources and balance of exchange, etc.); and linkage mechanisms (the who, when, and how of concrete communication). Relative to this last issue, results of a study of "boundary spanners" -- individuals designated by

organizations to represent them in interorganizational relationships -- are discussed.

Hough, W. M. (1975). "School-university partnership for teacher growth." Educational Leadership, 32(2), 307-309.

The author identifies the barriers to collaborative efforts in pre- and in-service teacher education as: requiring hard work, time consuming, difficulty of using resources from the schools and the college in the most effective manner, utilizing the strengths of each participant, and institutional and academic integrity of credit for in-service activities.

Parity in decision making is identified as the key to effective collaboration. Barriers to parity in decision making are identified as institutional possessiveness and bureaucratic structures.

Hough uses several programs in teacher preservice and inservice to illustrate parity in decision making. He concludes that once the parity concept is understood and accepted, the equal weight of responsibility enhances the possibility of effective programming for teacher pre- and in-service.

Hurwitz, E., et al. (1976). Accepting cooperation between school districts and universities: A case study and guidelines. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 124 843).

Experiences from developing a cooperative model for a university and a school district were used to form guidelines to help others plan such programs. Three sets of guidelines are included: 1) Guidelines for promoting a school/university partnership; 2) Guidelines for facilitating staff development in an educational partnership; and 3) Guidelines for university involvement in an educational partnership. There is a general discussion of each guideline and techniques that were helpful in implementing the guidelines are included. Guidelines for establishing a school/university partnership include: developing and maintaining a method for ongoing communication between the school district and the university; developing a set of defined goals and a perception of how the other component is involved; avoiding a significant outlay of funds or relying totally on outside funding; and, realizing that both the school district and the university are faced with pressures from various self-interest groups and that these self-interest groups must be taken into account when planning a collaborative effort. The authors assert that school systems and universities differ in self-image, in reward systems, and in working styles and that each must be willing to compromise in these areas for collaboration to effectively work.

Jones, A. H. and Barnes, C. D. (1984). "The California consortium: A case study on seeking change in teacher education." Journal of Teacher Education, 35(6), 5-10.

Describes efforts to promote implementation of an internship/residency model for new teachers through cooperation among school districts, teacher preparation programs, and professional associations. Of the eight colleges and universities involved in the consortium, only one was able to achieve joint approval of an internship/residency program with a school district (Los Angeles Unified-USC). Problems encountered by Consortium members were grouped into seven categories: Intern/Resident Placement, Cost, Lack of Cooperative Structures, Questions of Control, Institutional Barriers, Regulatory Barriers, and Professional Barriers. Reasons why the Los Angeles-USC program overcame these barriers are presented. Lack of success in promoting collaboration is attributed primarily to the failure of the Consortium to anticipate problems it would confront with respect to lack of institutional resources for new programs, as well as the difficulties inherent in attempting any

significant structural change in the traditional patterns of teacher education.

Lieberman, J. E. (1985). "Combining high school and college: LaGuardia's middle college high school." In Daly, W. T. (Ed.), College-School Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 47-57.

Describes problems and solutions involved in developing a Middle College through a full integration of high school, college, and the world of work. Problems included funding; elimination of stereotypes regarding teenagers; meshing two cultures (high school and college); providing for counseling of students; developing professional pride as it relates to traditional status differences between high school teachers and college faculty; generating economies through overcoming bureaucratic incompatibilities such as scheduling, work weeks, etc. Several recommendations are made for educators who are considering major institutional innovations requiring collaboration. With respect to time, the first suggestion is to define goals carefully and develop programs consistent with these goals. It is noted that at least a year of planning is needed as well as considerable funds. Second, the partnerships must have cooperation at the highest level of administration from both the high school and the college sector. Time is also necessary to bridge the two cultures of high school and college faculty and to institutionalize the new structure. Regarding incentives, it is noted that the plan should include rewards for both groups. From the college viewpoint, for example, working with the high school should count for tenure and promotion or time-off incentives that are real and germane. To provide incentives for administrative personnel, it is suggested that personnel be anchored in the college framework. Those acting in a liaison capacity often operate on the fringe of both high school and college, usually have no decision-making powers in either setting and, consequently may be bypassed by routine communications and can only persuade and cajole. To succeed, institutions need to give the collaborative a position of priority, one where it will have a voice in the operational framework. Ideally, collaboratives should share physical facilities. To work effectively, the innovative collaborative also demands a cheerful physical setting. The buildings housing the program should not be the ones no one else wants, or those long decayed by disuse.

Little, J. W. (1984[1]). Moving toward continuous school improvement. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 590).

Collaboration is approached from the perspective of conducting research in the classroom. The principle of such collaboration for professional development is identified as the establishment of trust between the teacher and the researcher.

According to Little, the aspects involved in trust are: 1) working as hard as an observer as the teacher is working at teaching; 2) the opportunity of influence (equal say); 3) developing criteria and procedures to avoid hurting one another's feelings; and 4) concentrating on the language of the people.

Ways in which colleagues establish trust are discussed and Little concludes that successful professional development requires the development of relations that are characterized by such trust.

Little, J. W. (1984[2]). "Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development." Teachers College Record, 86(1), 84-102.

Compares two staff-development programs to illustrate the organization, initiative, and skills required to achieve collaborative, rigorous programs of effective professional development. Describes provisions for collaboration

among staff developers, principals and teachers that helped to ensure collaboration. These include: a four-stage negotiation with pilot schools to gain shared agreements of three sorts (promise of the program idea, nature of roles and relationships, and adequacy of the description to reflect an actual sequence of implementation); conduct of "staff development" in ways that are properly reciprocal; allowance for sufficient time in terms of both frequency and duration; and explicit requirements that principals assume a more direct leadership role and are supported in doing so. Concludes that staff development is most influential where it: 1) ensures collaboration adequate to produce shared understanding, shared investment, thoughtful development, and the fair, rigorous test of selected ideas; 2) requires collective participation in training and implementation; 3) is focused on crucial problems of curriculum and instruction; 4?) is conducted often enough and long enough to ensure progressive gains in knowledge, skill and confidence; and 5) is congruent with and contributes to professional habits and norms of collegiality and experimentation. Notes that these complex design characteristics present dilemmas and challenges for those who conduct such efforts. A disproportionate concentration of staff resource is required. Funding is essential and often obtained from external sources; thus shifts in dollars and priorities often jeopardize the project. Exclusivity (limiting participation on basis of certain criteria) may foster success but limits impact; thus a program of preparation that would equip interested schools to compete successfully for preparation may be needed. The essentiality of direct involvement and leadership of building principals calls for practices for which most principals are neither prepared, selected, nor rewarded. Also, successful programs rest on long-term habits of shared work and shared problem solving which are atypical in schools. Finally, a fit of staff development with major lines of program development and authority is critical. However, there is no evidence that the projects described in this report were any more centrally connected to the structures of power and policy nor any less subject to shifts in budget priorities than projects described in other studies. The author concludes it is implausible that a small cadre of staff developers in any district will add measurably to the general fund of teachers' knowledge, skill, and enthusiasm or that programs of the type described could be mounted by a district on a scale large enough to exert widespread influence. The larger problem is thus one of organization, leadership and scale and the guidelines generated here are most properly seen as guidelines for the organization and leadership of professional work in the day-to-day world of teaching.

Lutkus, A. D. (1985). "Testing and reporting on graduates: The New Jersey basic skills assessment program." In Daly, W. T. (Ed.), College-School Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 7-15.

Based on experiences gained through New Jersey's statewide testing program, it is concluded that improving the competency of college freshmen will require colleges and state educational agencies to go beyond testing to work cooperatively with the pre-college community. Furthermore, collaborations between college and pre-college communities will have to include the upgrading of teacher professionalism; improvement of standards in college teacher education programs; a streamlining of high school curriculum to emphasize basic subjects over electives; and consideration of drastic changes in "classroom" methods of educational delivery in recognition of the coming demographic shifts toward a preponderance of minority children in the schools. Also in terms of method, it is noted that any start-up collaboration must have a "grass-roots" character or it will fail.

Maeroff, G. I. (1983). School and College: Partnerships in Education. A Carnegie Foundation Special Report. Lawrenceville, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Describes school-college collaboration by presenting selected case studies of programs organized around five themes: Setting standards, Accelerating students, Preparing teachers, Blends: Experiments in Transition; Minorities: A Shared Mandate; and Special Models. Concludes that cooperation among the nation's colleges and schools is absolutely urgent but that if they are to succeed: a common agenda must be acknowledged; a true spirit of collaboration must emerge; a single project must be identified; and the focus must be on activities, not machinery.

Maloy, R. W. (1985). "The multiple realities of school-university collaboration." Educational Forum, 49(3), 341-350.

Views of collaboration as social interactions based on multiple, rather than mutual, realities in which interactants erroneously assume reciprocity of perspectives. Discusses three assumptions which characterize collaborative efforts: "need to" assumptions where schools-universities believe they are required to collaborate; "ought to" assumptions where schools-universities collaborate within an I-would-be-better-off-if-we-worked-together framework; and "want-to" assumptions where schools-universities choose to work together either formally or informally. Presents a matrix depicting nine different conditions under which collaboration may occur. Notes these conditions are in marked contrast to the predominant view of collaboration as the realization by two organizations of a common reason for working together. Concludes that cooperating groups and organizations should form around common means and that the path to collaborative success is using these common means to achieve diverse goals.

Mergendoller, J. R. (1981). Mutual inquiry: The role of collaborative research on teaching in school-based staff development. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 230 496).

The author argues that collaborative research can contribute to teacher's personal growth and professional development as well as to the coordination of instructional approaches and goals throughout the school. Collaborative research on teaching is defined as "research conducted inside the classroom by two or more individuals with different role orientations and professional concerns." The author drew upon examples of two collaborative research projects to describe three conditions that must exist for collaborative research to be successful: 1) the establishment of parity among collaborators (Parity is defined as mutual.); 2) the maintenance of reciprocal relationships among team members (Reciprocity occurs when each member of the team has something valued to share with the others.); 3) the establishment of a common language (A common language must exist for the different team members to understand each other's concerns.) Three collaborative research activities are suggested: 1) open-ended interviews; 2) collaborative data analysis; and 3) collaborative planning. The author concludes that such activities "directs the attention of an entire faculty toward their own instructional problem solving and growth. This collaboration engages teachers and researchers in mutual inquiry -- a process which we believe should be at the heart of any staff development program."

Metzner, S. (1970). "School-university partnership: A tale of dichotomous desires." Phi Delta Kappan, 51(6), 328-329.

Asserts that the basic reason for the lack of success in school-university joint ventures is that university and public

school personnel have diametrically opposed views regarding both the dimensions of the problem and the basic aims and objectives of education. Proposes three guidelines for joint ventures between public schools and university school of education. First, no collaborative school-university operation should be undertaken without having chosen a school with a principal who understands the university's research-change orientation and has the ability to relate this orientation to aims, objectives and attitudes of his teachers. Second, teaching staff must be specially chosen on the basis of age (20's and 30's), experience (less than 10 years), demonstration of professional orientation (inservice credits above minimum for salary increase), possession of master's degree, and as advanced a grade level as possible consistent with objectives of the program. Finally, there must be close and continual involvement of administrators, teaching faculty, and university personnel in all phases of the planning and evaluation of activities.

Michigan State Department of Education. (1977). Professional development for school staffs: The Michigan approach. Lansing, Michigan: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 150 691).

Describes efforts by the Michigan State Department of Education to establish a statewide delivery system for educational staff development. Professional development centers are a part of the network that requires collaboration between the state department, institutions of higher education, and local education agencies. Professional development centers were identified as an integral part of the network due to their ability to provide opportunities for professional development not included or provided by the other component areas of the network (graduate courses, locally based staff training, state and federal categorically funded programs, and regional advisory councils on professional development). Three requirements were established for the planning of such centers: 1) the development of a governance system that involves all levels of planning, implementation and evaluation the representation of program participants, including classroom teachers, administrators, and the representatives of appropriate institutions of higher education; 2) a governance plan that provides for periodic evaluation of the structure; and, 3) a specific relationship with regional advisory councils on professional development.

Mills, J. R. (1984). "Addressing the separate-but-equal predicament in teacher preparation: A case study." Journal of Teacher Education. 35(6), 18-23.

Describes the initial efforts of two colleges of education at historically segregated institutions to cooperate on the student teaching phase of preservice programming. Program assessment data are reported and guidelines for collaboration are presented: (1) Cooperative arrangements that address a common need of both institutions are likely to engender less resistance from students and faculties; (2) Personnel who implement cooperative inter-institutional projects should support project objectives and processes, have adequate preparation in the areas targeted for cooperation, and willingly work as a team to plan, develop, and implement project activities; (3) More effective learning will result from joint short-term projects when they are supported by quality introductory and follow-up activities in the regular training program; and (4) Inter-institutional cooperative arrangements dictate that operational and programmatic differences between institutions be considered in the early planning stages and that adjustments made to address the needs of students and faculties. Concludes that successful collaboration requires more than cosmetic changes and paper transactions. People must physically come together in a climate of mutual trust and cooperation. They must have a common purpose and be willing to break with tradition by combining and reorganizing existing resources.

Nadler, B. and Merron, M. (1980). "Collaboration: A model for survival for schools of education." Journal of Education, 162(4), 55-62.

Discusses four impediments to the involvement of schools of education in inservice education. First, a considerable amount of time is demanded by collaborative arrangements. Time needed to fulfill demands of cooperative effort may diminish faculty prospects for tenure. Failure to change the university reward system could thwart efforts to develop collaborative working relationships. Second, since faculty members are not equally suited for various functions associated with inservice programs, some attempt to move in the direction of differentiated staffing appears essential not only to inservice projects, but to ensure the vitality of the university. Third, assigning college staff to local districts raises difficulties in terms of the traditional mode of assigning faculty on the basis of a uniform system of credit hours. The introduction of varying assignments will require considerable negotiation with regard to equity of time, esteem, and promotion value. Also faculty may be reluctant to relinquish their roles as independent consultants and, consequently, what may be a very lucrative second source of income. Finally, new delivery modes will be required in that ongoing relationship between school districts and universities do not translate readily into the traditional course credit model.

Neale, D. C. (1977). Del Mod: A statewide system for school improvement. University of Delaware: College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 150 684).

Describes a statewide project to improve science and math education in the elementary and secondary schools of Delaware. The general goal of the project was to coordinate all segments of science education from pre-elementary through the doctoral level. In this instance, science education refers to all university activities designed for the specific purpose of preparing a science or math teacher at the pre-service and/or in-service level. The central aspect that facilitated the project, according to the author, was the substantial grant monies that allowed the "purchase" of high levels of cooperation between the various agencies involved. The author concluded that the principal assumption of the project was that federal subsidies to establish such a system might result in a permanent enterprise funded by state and local sources. He asserted that the "seed money" strategy appeared to work against the establishing of state and local resources for a cooperative system such as Del Mod.

Ogle, D. (1983). Collaboration for school improvement. Evanston, Illinois: National Center of Education, Occasional paper No. 3. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 304).

Describes the development and implementation of an inservice program involving college faculty and principals and teachers from a small, local elementary school district made possible by the complementary interests of college faculty and the district. The district superintendent recognized a need to develop the instructional leadership of his principals. Additionally, since the district had no focused program of staff development in several years, this need was high on its priorities. College faculty were described as being particularly interested in bridging theory and practice and oriented toward school-based research. The program was funded by an external grant with project activities planned and directed entirely by college personnel. Input from school participants was obtained through administration of various assessment instruments, structured interviews, questionnaires, and informal discussion. It was found that the project was heavily influenced by external events often unanticipated and all beyond the control of project staff. When external funds were no longer available, there was concern that the program would be

terminated. The district did, however, make the decision to continue the program in the next year and this was considered indicative of the success of the collaborative effort.

O'Keefe, M. (1981). "High school/college cooperative programs." High School/College Partnerships. 1981 Current Issues in Higher Education No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 5-9.

Twelve high school/college programs around the country are used to illustrate both the wide range of projects that have been developed as well as the elements needed for success. It is noted that each of these successful projects incorporates a practical recognition of the common elements of the missions of the high school and the college. Most are intended to improve the continuity and effectiveness of the curriculum at both levels. Most address the need to enhance professional relationships between teachers and professors. It is concluded that when these elements are present, many of the problems created by the separateness of the high school and the college can be overcome.

Pugach, M. C. & Allen-Meares, P. (1985). "Collaboration at the preservice level." TESE, 8(1), 3-11.

The authors assert that collaboration is a desirable goal because it allows those involved the ability to transcend professional self-interests and pool adult expertise for the good of the school as well as the student. Characteristics of an ideal collaboration are identified as: the existence of a unitary goal, mutuality of effort, overcoming the protection of professional "territory," trust between professionals to solve problems jointly, and understanding of and mutual respect for the different contributions of every school-based professional. The authors state that in practice collaboration has typically been restricted to formal activities that required interaction among professionals. The authors cite two studies that indicate one of the major barriers to collaboration continues to be the isolation of preservice preparation of those professionals who work in the schools and present a model for collaboration between teacher training programs and schools at the preservice level.

Roper, S. S. and Nolan, R. B. (1977). Down from the ivory tower: A model of collaborative in-service education. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 261).

Describes a model of collaborative inservice education based on a Teacher Corps Project sponsored by the School of Education at Stanford University and a San Jose high school. The model is based on two conclusions: 1) that inservice programs have usually been planned from the "outside" rather than through practicing teachers, and 2) that individuals rather than entire school staffs have been the clients. As a result of these conclusions this model utilizes teachers as both the policy makers and in-service educators, administrators as coordinators rather than directors, and university personnel as "go-fers" who find people, articles, and ideas that might be useful to the staff. Establishing collegiality is identified as a key to developing better relationships between schools and universities. The authors conclude that through this model university personnel come down from the ivory tower and treat the practitioner as a colleague rather than a client or a subject for research, thus collegiality is established.

Schaffer, E. C., Bryant, W. C., Buchanan, D., Keene, A., Pardue, B. & Robinette, N. G. (1983). Structures and processes for effective collaboration among localschools, colleges, and universities. A collaborative project of Kannapolis City Schools, Livingston College, and the

University of North Carolina - Charlotte. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 225 988).

Investigates the structures and functions of collaboration through a survey of current literature, a survey of local educators, and review of existing collaborative models. Concludes that: 1) collaboration between schools and other educational agencies is feasible, valuable and highly desired by professional educators; 2) collaborative programs do exist and may be replicated; 3) successful collaboration cannot develop without participants who are willing to share decision making; 4) many variables (i.e., geographic location, financial support, professional interest, etc.) influence the degree to which collaboration may occur. Describes a model for collaboration, including the model's characteristics and implications and recommendations for implementation. Assumptions undergirding the model are: 1) collaboration must include elements of authority, governance, finances, delivery of services and evaluation at every level of collaborative effort from state to local; 2) involvement of classroom teachers is critical for success; 3) financial resources must be committed from all sources to insure participation; 4) governance should include all agencies and all levels within an agency; 5) universities must be involved as partners in inductive/inservice activities, and the present role and funding must change; 6) schools must be involved as partners in preservice education; and 7) schools and universities must learn to use each other's skill and aid in fostering credibility between the groups.

Shive, R. J. (1984). "School and university partnerships: Meeting common needs." Improving College and University Teaching, 32(3), 119-122.

Analyzes three types of partnerships: school-college pairings; programs to integrate high school and colleges; professional development programs. Concludes that regardless of the nature of the specific school and university partnership, certain criteria for the success of any such collaborative arrangement emerge. First, specific goals, both short-term and long-term, should be clearly defined and periodically reviewed. Second, a system of rewards and benefits for school and university participants must be developed. Third, resources must be found to support a partnership or collaborative structure different from those currently receiving support. Fourth, both school and university faculty must develop ownership of the partnership program. Fifth, responsibility for achieving the goals of the partnership must be clearly fixed. Sixth, ample planning time must be provided before implementation of the partnership.

Smith, M. P. (1985). "Early identification and support: The University of California-Berkeley's MESA program." In Daly, W. T. (Ed.), College-School-Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 19-25.

From the University of California-Berkeley's MESA Program aimed toward increasing the number of Black and Mexican-American students enrolled in the College of Engineering, the following factors were identified as contributing to success: 1) The program is designed to serve a very specific need that is of concern to all parties involved -- teachers, district administrators, target students, university faculty, industry, and parents; 2) With limited resources, the program focuses its efforts and does not try to take larger problems related to making changes in established educational institutions; 3) Services are designed to supplement and complement what schools already offer, in a manner that helps students get the most out of the schools' courses and teachers; 4) The program works with the schools' staff members who are most involved in the education of the participating students; 5) The

program works out of sixteen centers located at universities that work directly with the secondary schools in their areas; and 6) The program pays the salary of a full-time staff person at each center whose sole responsibility is to implement the program. Suggested from the MESA experience are also some general recommendations for those interested in establishing collaborative projects: 1) Any collaborative program must involve the principal parties in planning and conceptualization; 2) Any program that involves a school must have the approval of the superintendent and the full cooperation of the site principal; 3) The purpose of a program must be supported by all collaborative partners and the design of the program must focus upon that purpose alone; and 4) The program must be cost effective, making the best use of resources from all involved parties.

Sparks, G., Nowakowski, M., Hall, B., Alec, R., & Imrick, J. (1985). "School improvement through staff development." Educational Leadership, 41(6), 59-61.

A grant from the state of Michigan provided the funding for Wayne State University to develop the building level staff development program described in this article. The model is based on the premise that classroom teachers can best address their needs by identifying their own priorities and planning collaboratively to meet those needs. A university "facilitator" assists the school in the following stages: 1) development of readiness, awareness, and commitment; 2) needs assessment; 3) planning; 4) implementation; 5) evaluation; and 6) reassessment and continuation. A critical feature of this model is identified as the availability of funds to design and implement the program.

Sussman, R. A. (1982). Serving many masters: Dilemmas in school-university collaborations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 517).

Reports results of a study of collaboration between a medium-sized urban school district and three different types of institutions of higher education: a large public university, an Ivy League university, and a small private Graduate School of Education. Findings indicated that, regardless of the nature or focus of the collaborative effort, the success of the collaboration was seen entirely as a function of the interpersonal relationships between university and school staff. The key ingredient in successful working relationships was individual personality and not the organizational affiliation of the collaborator or his academic or professional training. Additionally, however, all groups (university and local school people) reported that the involvement of central school administration was crucial to the success of a collaborative project. A consistently cited impediment to collaboration was the problem of serving more than one master. The complexity of the inter-relationships between school staff, central office administrators and university personnel was a major obstacle to successful collaborative relationships. The formal and informal rules that guide the normal school day were put into question. Also university people tended to skip over mid-level administrators and principals to deal directly with teachers and thus were not only the cause of considerable friction within the school but cut themselves off from a better understanding of the school setting. However, most respondents saw collaboration as a maturing process; one in which each participant came not only to know and understand what to expect from their collaborator but also how to negotiate through difficulties. Overall, the authors conclude that findings of the study make clear the necessity of careful and explicit planning for interagency collaboarative efforts on many different levels. Underscored is the importance of continually keeping in mind the political climate in which a collaborative project occurs.

Van Voorhees, B. (1984). Staff development for school improvement: Field testing a model. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 835).

Describes a staff development program which is part of the National Center on Teaching and Learning at Eastern Michigan University and involves cooperation among school staff, local districts, intermediate school district personnel, the Michigan Department of Education staff and personnel from Eastern Michigan University. The Michigan legislature supports the program financially, thus enabling EMU to employ facilitators, provide money to schools for staff development, and support administration of the program. For the program to be initiated in a school, seventy-five percent of the staff must agree to participate. Conclusions reached after six years of program operation identify key factors of success as: the presence of a supportive principal, regular meetings of a school steering committee, at least weekly visits by the university facilitator to the school, maintenance of regular contact with the rest of the school staff by the steering committee, and bi-weekly meetings of the facilitators.

Vivian, J. R. (1985). "Empowering teachers as colleagues: The Yale-New Haven teacher institute." In Daly, W. T. (Ed.), College-School Collaboration: Appraising the Major Approaches. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, No. 24. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 79-89.

Observes that the Department of Education surveyed over 9,300 school districts nationwide for existing partnerships but that of 46,000 partnerships identified, only 5.2 percent are partnerships involving colleges and universities. Concludes that there is a need not only to sustain the national movement for partnerships in education, but also to increase the participation of colleges and universities within the movement. From experience in establishing the Teachers Institute, a joint program of Yale University and the New Haven Public Schools designed to strengthen teaching, the author offers guidelines for the successful implementation of school-university partnerships. First, there should be a coequal relationship of colleagues, a volunteer association of individuals who choose to work together. An equal importance must be attached to what each partner brings to the relationship. Institutional support must come from both sides of the partnership; tangible and highly visible evidence of such commitment is essential. Second, cooperative efforts should insist on a direct application in school classrooms, and not merely assume that their work together will somehow improve teaching and learning in the classroom. Third, programs should have well-defined and manageable goals; they should avoid making impossible claims. Fourth, an ongoing evaluation process is integral to a program's design and should be used perennially to refine both goals and activities. Because collaborative programs are often seen as nontraditional and are not regarded as central to the mission of either institutional partner, they have a special need to provide sound evidence of their results. Fifth, the most successful projects may well begin small, investing real authority in teacher leadership and developing organically based on the needs teachers identify. In that way, programs are not guided by preconceptions, but grow from their own local experience. Furthermore, efforts at school improvement will not succeed without teacher leadership; teachers have long been held responsible for the conditions of our schools without being empowered to improve schools. Finally, for the benefits to be lasting, effective collaboration programs must be long-term.

Weaver, J. F. (1979). "Collaboration: Why is sharing the turf so difficult?" Journal of Teacher Education, 30(1), 24-25.

Views collaboration as an agreed-upon distribution of power, status and authority. Negotiation of vested interests and conflicting need is therefore central to effective collaboration. Before engaging in collaboration representatives of various role groups must be prepared to take risks and to resist taking advantage of others in the governance body. The governance body, through negotiating individual matters, will thus become a new pluralistic subculture with its own cohesiveness and norms for behavior. Educators at all levels will be better prepared for collaboration if they experience training in group processes, conflict, management and negotiation. However, in colleges and universities where faculty and administrators do not control the content, design and delivery system for educational services, collaboration will be difficult since rapid and flexible responses for approval and implementation of proposed collaborative programs is required in the give and take of shared decision making. State departments of education personnel may also be needed for shared governance; however, freedom of such personnel to negotiate or collaborate may vary. Typically the school and its personnel are recipients of collaborative projects. Schools want maximum service for the least cost and they want to assess the value of the services. Thus the effectiveness of institutions of higher learning may be questioned but it is important to distinguish between purchaser wariness and outright rejection. Finally, unless colleges and universities have identified the advantages and limitations of collaboration which are unique to their mission and talents, they will not be prepared to share governance. Each role group participating in collaborative projects must be secure enough about what they can contribute and what they will gain before exposing themselves to the give and take of shared authority in specific situations. A university or college may not be able to discern its role in preservice or inservice education without considering demographic and and sociopolitical conditions. Whether collaboration is desirable or compatible with the institution's mission thus remains a question for each school or department of education to resolve.

Wheeler, A. H. and Ellerman, G. P. (1982). A model for collaborative inservice education. Paper presented at the Annual National Inservice Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 824).

Reports on efforts at Radford University to implement a collaborative model which will blend preservice and inservice education into one continuing process. Three assumptions undergird current attempts to implement such a model. First, the foundation of the model must be composed of established relationships between and among the teacher education institution and the school divisions it serves and these relationships must be characterized by honesty, candor and trust. Continuous emphasis upon field services and collaboration on grants and other projects are given as examples of how this foundation was laid. Second, after cooperative relationships are established, specific strategies must be implemented to assure meaningful results, expanded dialogue, and collaboration regarding both preservice and inservice programs. The delivery of special inservice courses designed by school personnel, the scheduling of student teaching conferences, the organization of a Dean's Advisory Council, and the provision of facilities and support for a Professional Development Center are examples of strategies used in this phase. Third, all cooperating institutions must recognize and have opportunities to benefit from the interchange of resources for the mutual benefit of all. Determination of teaching load equivalencies that allowed School of Education faculty to fulfill their contractual obligations by providing

services to the schools and development of a Teacher/Professor Exchange Program were cited as examples of interchange that proved beneficial to all.

Wilbur, F. P. (1984). "School-college partnerships: Building effective models for collaboration." NASSP Bulletin, 68(474), 34-49.

Describes nine successful cooperative ventures, considers what it takes to get such programs off the ground, and what it takes to sustain them and keep them responsive to changing needs. Identifies six principles that seem critical to the success of any school/college partnership: (1) Educators at both levels must recognize common needs and agree to focus on specific areas; (2) All participants must receive meaningful recognition and rewards; (3) The more an innovation is "owned" by those affected by its adoption, the more likely it will be accepted; (4) Although administrative mandates for change usually encounter resistance in the ranks, innovations that are implemented without accompanying support from top administrators usually do not meet with lasting success; (5) All persons involved in planning and implementing anything new should expect some problems; therefore, efforts must be made to establish and maintain trust and a sense of common purpose and procedures, roles, and responsibilities of the organizations and parties involved need to be clarified up front; and (6) Cooperative programs must focus on action, not machinery; time and time again. The most successful programs are those where people see a need and find time to act -- with little red tape or extra funding.

Wu, P. C. (1978). Facilitating university-school district inservice collaboration principles of communication. Pensacola, FL: University of West Florida. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 594).

Identifies communication as the key element to the success of the Teacher Education Centers which link the state universities of Florida to school districts. The paper describes strategies to improve communication within universities (internal) and communication between the organizations (external) involved in the collaborative effort. Suggestions to improve internal communication included: (1) establishing a chain of communication; (2) establishing two positions, one responsible to the dean at the higher education institution and one responsible to the school district; (3) establishing a physical location that facilitates communication; and (4) keeping department chairpersons current on collaborative activities. Suggestions to improve external communication included: (1) providing a description of outreach-staff-development programs in the institutional catalog; (2) having one person responsible for the dissemination of staff development information; and, (3) responding to school districts' requests in an expedient fashion. The author concludes that improved communication determines, to a large degree, the success of a collaborative effort.

Wu, P. C. (1986). "Lessons for collaboration between educational agencies. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(5), 61-74.

Addresses the topic of school-university collaboration with particular focus on the misconception that collaboration occurs naturally. Asserts that unless deliberate effort is expended, successful collaboration will not occur. Identifies seven principles of collaboration. These are: (1) mutual needs and benefits; (2) clear role expectations; (3) acceptable conditions under which both agencies must work; (4) a functional communication network; (5) administrative structure and support; (6) trust; and (7) a medium suited to the task.

Yarger, S. S. (1979). Some uncomfortable assertions about collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 170 274).

Challenges the concept of collaboration by presenting five assertions that seriously question many of the popular beliefs about collaboration. These assertions are: 1) collaboration in teacher education is becoming an end unto itself and is not a means for improving programs; 2) collaborative structures in teacher education tend to disrupt existing governance mechanisms, thus either impeding or isolating program development; 3) collaboration in teacher education is not related to quality or improvement in program development; 4) collaboration inhibits the ability of competent program developers to function freely and exhibit sensitivity to their clients; and 5) unless collaborative governance structures in teacher education operate as support systems for competent program developers, the process will lower rather than raise the quality of programs. Examples supporting each of these assertions are provided and possible solutions are offered.